

ON AN INEQUALITY OF A. GROTHENDIECK CONCERNING OPERATORS ON L^1

HASKELL ROSENTHAL

Department of Mathematics
The University of Texas at Austin
Austin, TX 78712

ABSTRACT. In 1955, A. Grothendieck proved a basic inequality which shows that any bounded linear operator between $L^1(\mu)$ -spaces maps (Lebesgue-) dominated sequences to dominated sequences. An elementary proof of this inequality is obtained via a new decomposition principle for the lattice of measurable functions. An exposition is also given of the M. Lévy extension theorem for operators defined on subspaces of $L^1(\mu)$ -spaces.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let μ, ν be measures on measurable spaces, and let $T : L^1(\mu) \rightarrow L^1(\nu)$ be a bounded linear operator (here $L^1(\mu)$ denotes the real or complex Banach space of (equivalence classes of) μ -integrable functions). In [G], (see Corollaire, page 67) Grothendieck establishes the following fundamental inequality:

$$(1) \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Given } f_1, \dots, f_n \text{ in } L^1(\mu), \text{ then} \\ \int \max_i |Tf_i| d\nu \leq \|T\| \int \max_i |f_i| d\mu . \end{array} \right.$$

We first give some motivation for the inequality, then give a proof involving an apparently new principle concerning the lattice of measurable functions.

Typeset by $\mathcal{A}\mathcal{M}\mathcal{S}$ -TEX

It follows easily from (1) that every such operator maps *dominated* (or *order bounded*) sequences into dominated sequences. In fact, it follows that

$$(2) \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{if } F \text{ is a family in } L^1(\mu) \text{ for which there exists a } \mu\text{-integrable } \varphi \text{ with} \\ |f| \leq \varphi \text{ a.e. for all } f \text{ in } F, \text{ then there exists a non-negative } \nu\text{-integrable} \\ \psi \text{ with } \int \psi d\nu \leq \|T\| \int \varphi d\mu \text{ so that } |Tf| \leq \psi \text{ a.e. for all } f \text{ in } F. \end{array} \right.$$

This consequence of (1) (which is of course equivalent to (1)) is drawn explicitly by Grothendieck in [G] (see Proposition 10, page 66).

In the summer of 1979, during her research visit to the University of Texas at Austin, I suggested to Mireille Lévy that the inequality (1) might actually characterize those operators from a subspace of $L^1(\mu)$ to $L^1(\nu)$, which extend to an operator on all of $L^1(\mu)$. She indeed confirmed my conjecture [L]. Combining Lévy's result with (1) and a simple application of the closed graph theorem, we obtain the

Extension Theorem. *Let μ, ν be measures on measurable spaces, X a closed linear subspace of $L^1(\mu)$, and $T : X \rightarrow L^1(\nu)$ a bounded linear operator. Then the following assertions are equivalent:*

- (a) *T maps dominated sequences to dominated sequences.*
- (b) *There is a constant C so that*

$$(3) \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{given } n \text{ and } f_1, \dots, f_n \text{ in } X, \text{ then} \\ \int \max_i |Tf_i| d\nu \leq C \int \max_i |f_i| d\mu . \end{array} \right.$$

- (c) *There is a bounded linear operator $\tilde{T} : L^1(\mu) \rightarrow L^1(\nu)$ with $\tilde{T}|_X = T$.*

Moreover if α denotes the smallest C satisfying (3), then $\tilde{T}$ may be chosen with $\|\tilde{T}\| = \alpha$.

A remarkable development of the setting for the Extension Theorem has recently been given in a series of papers by G. Pisier. In [P1], Pisier obtains an extension

theorem for operators on H^1 to $L^1(\mu)$ which are also bounded from H^∞ to $L^\infty(\mu)$. In [P2, Theorem 3], he obtains the appropriate generalization of the Extension Theorem for operators from a subspace of $L^p(\mu)$ to $L^1(\nu)$, $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, and in fact in the more general setting of Banach lattices. Finally, in [P3, Theorem 3.5], Pisier obtains a non-commutative version of the Theorem. In Section 3, we give a proof of the Extension Theorem following the approach in [P1]. This also yields a rather quick alternate “functional-analytical” proof of (1). For a given subspace X of L^1 , our exposition yields an explicit representation for elements of $X(L^\infty)$, the closure of $X \otimes L^\infty$ in $L^1(L^\infty)$ (see the Corollary towards the end of Section 3), which also suggests an open question regarding $X(L^\infty)$ (see the second Remark following the Corollary’s statement).

We note one last motivating connection. Grothendieck’s “ L^1 -inequality” (1) follows immediately from the classical Banach lattice result that every such operator T has an absolute value, or modulus, $|T|$, which is a linear operator from $L^1(\mu)$ to $L^1(\nu)$ with $\|(T)\| = \|T\|$ and

$$(4) \quad |Tf| \leq |T| |f| \text{ for all } f \in L^1(\mu)$$

(cf. [S]). However the existence of $|T|$ may readily be deduced from (1), which thus certainly appears more basic and elementary.

2. A DECOMPOSITION PRINCIPLE FOR THE LATTICE OF MEASURABLE FUNCTIONS

We first formulate the principle for the case of real scalars.

Lemma 1. *Let $f_1, \dots, f_n$ be real valued measurable functions on a measurable space. There exist k (depending only on n) and non-negative measurable functions $h_1, \dots, h_k$ so that*

- (i) $h_1 + \dots + h_k = |f_1| \vee \dots \vee |f_n|$;
- (ii) for all i , there exist $\varepsilon_{ij} \in \{0, 1, -1\}$ with $f_i = \sum_{j=1}^k \varepsilon_{ij} h_j$.

Remark. We do not need the fact that the k in Lemma 1 depends only on n . Nevertheless, let $k(n)$ be the optimal choice for k . What is $k(n)$? The order of magnitude of $k(n)$? Shortly after circulating the original version of this paper, V. Mascioni completely solved this problem, proving that one may choose $k(n) = 2^n$, and this is best possible [M]. (Our proof below yields only that $k(n) \leq e^{1/2} 2^n n!$; also see the remark following Lemma 2.)

We first deduce the Grothendieck inequality for real scalars from Lemma 1. Given T and $f_1, \dots, f_n$ in $L^1(\mu)$, choose $h_1, \dots, h_k$ and the ε_{ij} 's as in the Lemma. Then for each i , we have

$$(5) \quad |Tf_i| = \left| \sum \varepsilon_{ij} Th_j \right| \leq \sum_j |Th_j| .$$

Hence

$$(6) \quad \max_i |Tf_i| \leq \sum_j |Th_j| .$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
 (7) \quad \int \max_i |Tf_i| d\nu &= \int \sum_j |Th_j| d\nu && \text{by (6)} \\
 &= \sum_j \int |Th_j| d\nu \\
 &\leq \|T\| \sum_j \int h_j d\mu && \text{since } h_j \geq 0 \text{ for all } j \\
 &= \|T\| \int \sum_j h_j d\mu \\
 &= \|T\| \int \max |f_i| d\mu && \text{by (i) of the Lemma.}
 \end{aligned}$$

Proof of Lemma 1.

We prove the result by induction on n . Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{S})$ be the associated measurable space; i.e., $\mathcal{S}$ is a σ -algebra of subsets of Ω , and the f_i 's are $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable functions

defined on Ω . For $n = 1$, let $h_1 = f_1^+$, $h_2 = f_1^-$ (where as usual, e.g., $f_1^+(\omega) = f_1(\omega)$ if $f_1(\omega) \geq 0$; $f_1^+(\omega) = 0$ otherwise). Of course then $|f_1| = h_1 + h_2$, $f_1 = h_1 - h_2$. Now let $n \geq 1$, and suppose the Lemma proved for n . Let $f_1, \dots, f_{n+1}$ be given measurable functions on Ω . Choose disjoint measurable sets $E_1, \dots, E_{n+1}$ so that $\Omega = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n+1} E_i$ and

$$(8) \quad |f_1|(\omega) \vee \dots \vee |f_{n+1}|(\omega) = |f_i(\omega)| \text{ for all } \omega \in E_i, \text{ all } i.$$

Now fix i and apply the induction hypothesis to $f_1, \dots, f_{i-1}, f_{i+1}, \dots, f_{n+1}$ on E_i . We obtain $h_{i1}, \dots, h_{ik} \geq 0$ (k depends only on n) measurable functions so that

$$(9) \quad \sum_{j=1}^k h_{ij} = (|f_1| \vee \dots \vee |f_{i-1}| \vee |f_{i+1}| \vee \dots \vee |f_{n+1}|) \chi_{E_i} \stackrel{\text{df}}{=} \tau_i$$

and so that for each $j \neq i$, there are numbers $\varepsilon_{j\ell}^i$ in $\{0, 1, -1\}$ with

$$(10) \quad f_j \chi_{E_i} = \sum_{\ell=1}^k \varepsilon_{j\ell}^i h_{i\ell}.$$

Let $E_i^+ = \{\omega : f_i(\omega) \geq 0\}$. $E_i^- = \{\omega : f_i(\omega) < 0\}$. We now claim the following family of functions works, for our “ h_i ’s” for $n+1$:

$$(11) \quad \begin{cases} h_{i\ell} \chi_{E_i^+}, h_{i\ell} \chi_{E_i^-}, \\ (f_i - \tau_i) \chi_{E_i^+}, (-f_i - \tau_i) \chi_{E_i^-} \\ (1 \leq i \leq n+1, 1 \leq \ell \leq k). \end{cases}$$

Evidently if k' denotes the total number of functions listed in (11), then

$$(12) \quad k' = 2(n+1)(k+1).$$

Now, all of these functions are non-negative (the last two types because $|f_i| \geq \tau_i$ on E_i , by (8)). To verify (i) of the Lemma, note that for each i ,

$$(13) \quad |f_i| \chi_{E_i} = (f_i - \tau_i) \chi_{E_i^+} + \sum_{\ell=1}^k h_{i\ell} \chi_{E_i^+} + (-f_i - \tau_i) \chi_{E_i^-} + \sum_{\ell=1}^k h_{i\ell} \chi_{E_i^-}.$$

Thus, letting $h_1, \dots, h_{k'}$ be the functions listed in (11), we have that

$$(14) \quad |f_1| \vee \dots \vee |f_{n+1}| = \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} |f_i| \chi_{E_i} = \sum_{r=1}^{k'} h_r .$$

Finally, to verify (ii), fix j . Then

$$(15) \quad \begin{aligned} f_j \chi_{E_j} &= f_j \chi_{E_j^+} + f_j \chi_{E_j^-} \\ &= (f_j - \tau_j) \chi_{E_j^+} + \tau_j \chi_{E_j^+} - (-f_j - \tau_j) \chi_{E_j^-} - \tau_j \chi_{E_j^-} \\ &= (f_j - \tau_j) \chi_{E_j^+} + \sum_{\ell=1}^k h_{j\ell} \chi_{E_j^+} - (-f_j - \tau_j) \chi_{E_j^-} + \sum_{\ell=1}^k -h_{j\ell} \chi_{E_j^-} . \end{aligned}$$

Thus from (10) and (15), we obtain $\varepsilon_{jr} = 0, 1$, or -1 for all r so that

$$(16) \quad f_j = \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} f_j \chi_{E_i} = \sum_{r=1}^{k'} \varepsilon_{jr} h_r . \quad \square$$

We next treat the case of complex scalars.

Lemma 2. *Let $f_1, \dots, f_n$ be complex valued measurable functions on a measurable space. There exist k (depending only on n) and non-negative measurable functions $h_1, \dots, h_k$ so that*

- (i) $h_1 + \dots + h_k = |f_1| \vee \dots \vee |f_n|$.
- (ii) *for all i , there exist measurable functions ε_{ij} so that $|\varepsilon_{ij}(\omega)| = 1$ or 0 for all j , with $f_i = \sum_{j=1}^k \varepsilon_{ij} h_j$*

Remark. Let $k_{\mathbb{C}}(n)$ denote the optimal choice for k . As in the real scalars case, we again ask what is the order of magnitude of $k_{\mathbb{C}}$? Our argument below yields that $k_{\mathbb{C}}(n) \leq en!$. (V. Mascioni has also solved this problem, proving that $k_{\mathbb{C}}(n) = 2^n - 1$ [M].)

The deduction of the Grothendieck L^1 -inequality involves the following

Corollary. *Let $f_1, \dots, f_n$ be as in Lemma 2, and let $\varepsilon > 0$. There exist $h_1, \dots, h_k$ non-negative measurable functions satisfying (i) of Lemma 1 and (ii) for all i there exist numbers α_{ij} with $|\alpha_{ij}| = 1$ or 0 for all j , and*

$$(17) \quad \left| f_i - \sum_{j=1}^k \alpha_{ij} h_j \right| \leq \varepsilon (|f_1| \vee \dots \vee |f_n|) .$$

Comment. If the ε_{ij} 's in Lemma 2 can be chosen as simple functions (which is of course the case if the f_i 's are simple), then the dependence of the α_{ij} 's on ε may be eliminated; i.e., we then have $f_i = \sum_j \alpha_{ij} h_j$ for all i . Note this is the case if the f_i 's are all real-valued; thus Lemma 2 implies Lemma 1.

Proof of the Corollary using Lemma 2. Let the h_i 's and ε_{ij} 's satisfy the conclusion of Lemma 2. We may choose disjoint measurable sets $F_1, \dots, F_r$ with $\Omega = \bigcup_{i=1}^r F_i$, so that for every ν , $1 \leq \nu \leq r$, every i , $1 \leq i \leq n$, and all j , $1 \leq j \leq k$, there is a number ε_{ij}^ν , with $|\varepsilon_{ij}^\nu| = 1$ or $\varepsilon_{ij}^\nu = 0$, so that

$$(18) \quad |\varepsilon_{ij}(\omega) - \varepsilon_{ij}^\nu| \leq \varepsilon \text{ for all } \omega \in F_\nu .$$

We now claim: *The family of functions*

$$h_i \chi_{F_\nu} \quad 1 \leq i \leq k, \quad 1 \leq \nu \leq r ,$$

serves as our “ h_ℓ ’s”; for each i , the constant ε_{ij}^ν serves as our “ $\alpha_{i\ell}$.” Indeed, we have that

$$(19) \quad \sum_{i,\nu} h_i \chi_{F_\nu} = |f_1| \vee \dots \vee |f_n| .$$

Finally, fix i, ν . Then

$$(20) \quad \begin{aligned} \left| f_i \chi_{F_\nu} - \sum_j \varepsilon_{ij}^\nu h_j \chi_{F_\nu} \right| &= \left| \sum_j (\varepsilon_{ij} - \varepsilon_{ij}^\nu) h_j \chi_{F_\nu} \right| \text{ by Lemma 2(ii)} \\ &\leq \varepsilon \sum_j h_j \chi_{F_\nu} = \varepsilon (|f_1| \vee \dots \vee |f_n|) \chi_{F_\nu} . \end{aligned}$$

Since the F_ν 's are a partition of Ω , the result is proved. $\square$

Proof of Lemma 2. Again we proceed by induction. For any measurable complex valued function f , let

$$(\operatorname{sgn} f)(\omega) = \frac{f(\omega)}{|f(\omega)|} \text{ if } f(\omega) \neq 0, \quad \operatorname{sgn} f(\omega) = 0 \text{ otherwise.}$$

Of course now the $n = 1$ case is “completely” trivial; simply let $h_1 = |f_1|$ and

$$\varepsilon_1(\omega) = \operatorname{sgn} f_1(\omega) .$$

Again, suppose Lemma 2 proved for n , and let $f_1, \dots, f_{n+1}$ be given measurable functions. Choose the measurable partition $E_1, \dots, E_{n+1}$ satisfying (8), and proceed exactly as in the case of Lemma 1. Thus, we obtain h_{ij} 's, $1 \leq j \leq k$ satisfying (9) (with τ_i as defined in (9)), so that for each $j \neq i$, there are measurable functions $\varepsilon_{j\ell}^i$ with $|\varepsilon_{j\ell}^i(\omega)| = 0$ or 1 for all ω , satisfying (10). Now we claim that the family of “ h_i ’s” may be taken to be

$$(21) \quad h_{i\ell}, \quad (|f_i| - \tau_i)\chi_{E_i}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n+1, \quad 1 \leq \ell \leq k .$$

Thus listing these as $h_1, \dots, h_{k'}$, we have

$$(22) \quad k' = (k+1)(n+1) .$$

Lemma 2(i) now follows immediately, for

$$(23) \quad |f_i|\chi_{E_i} = (|f_i| - \tau_i)\chi_{E_i} + \sum_{\ell=1}^k h_{i\ell} \text{ for all } i .$$

It remains to verify (ii). Fix j . Then

$$(24) \quad (f_j - (\operatorname{sgn} f_j)\tau_j)\chi_{E_j} = (\operatorname{sgn} f_j)(|f_j| - \tau_j)\chi_{E_j} .$$

Thus

$$(25) \quad f_j \chi_{E_j} = (\operatorname{sgn} f_j)(|f_j| - \tau_j \chi_{E_j}) + \sum_{\ell=1}^k (\operatorname{sgn} f_j) h_{j\ell} \quad \text{by (9).}$$

Combining (10) and (25), we thus obtain our measurable functions $\varepsilon_{j1}, \dots, \varepsilon_{jk'}$ valued in $\mathbb{T} \cup \{0\}$ with

$$\begin{aligned} (26) \quad f_j &= \sum_{i \neq j} f_j \chi_{E_i} + f_j \chi_{E_j} \\ &= (\operatorname{sgn} f_j)(|f_j| - \tau_j \chi_{E_j}) + \sum_{\ell=1}^k (\operatorname{sgn} f_j) h_{j\ell} + \sum_{i \neq j} \sum_{\ell=1}^k \varepsilon_{j\ell}^i h_{i\ell} \\ &= \sum_{\ell=1}^{k'} \varepsilon_{j\ell} h_{\ell} . \end{aligned}$$

□

We conclude Section 2 with a deduction of the complex Grothendieck L^1 -inequality. Let then μ, ν be measures on measurable spaces, $T : L^1(\mu) \rightarrow L^1(\nu)$ be a bounded linear operator, and $f_1, \dots, f_n$ in $L^1(\mu)$ be given. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be given, and choose $h_1, \dots, h_k$ and the complex numbers α_{ij} as in the conclusion of the Corollary to Lemma 2.

Now for each i , define p_i by

$$(27) \quad p_i = f_i - \sum_{j=1}^k \alpha_{ij} h_j .$$

Then we have that $f_i = \sum \alpha_{ij} h_j + p_i$ and moreover

$$(28) \quad |p_i| \leq \varepsilon(|f_1| \vee \dots \vee |f_n|) \quad \text{by (ii) of the Corollary.}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
 (29) \quad |Tf_i| &= \left| \sum_j \alpha_{ij} Th_j + Tp_i \right| \\
 &\leq \sum_j |Th_j| + |Tp_i| \quad \text{since } |\alpha_{ij}| \leq 1 \text{ for all } j \\
 &\leq \sum_j |Th_j| + \sum_j |Tp_j|.
 \end{aligned}$$

Thus also

$$(30) \quad \max_i |Tf_i| \leq \sum_j (|Th_j| + |Tp_j|),$$

whence

$$\begin{aligned}
 (31) \quad \int \max_i |Tf_i| d\nu &\leq \sum_j \int (|Th_j| + |Tp_j|) d\nu \\
 &\leq \|T\| \left(\int \sum_j h_j d\mu + \int \sum_j |p_j| d\mu \right) \\
 &\leq (1 + n\varepsilon) \|T\| \int \max_i |f_i| d\mu \text{ by (i) of the Corollary and (28).}
 \end{aligned}$$

Since $\varepsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, the inequality (1) is proved. $\square$

3. A PROOF OF THE EXTENSION THEOREM

As noted in the introduction, we follow the approach in [P1], thus obtaining an alternate proof of the Grothendieck L^1 -inequality. (The approach, despite its brevity, seems considerably more sophisticated than the elementary proof given by our decomposition result, however.) Throughout, let μ, ν and T be as in the statement of the Extension Theorem. We shall also assume that ν is “nice enough” so that $(L^1(\nu))^* = L^\infty(\nu)$ (any $L^1(\nu)$ is isometric to $L^1(\nu')$ with ν' nice).

(a) $\Rightarrow$ (b) For Y a subspace of $L^1(\mu)$ or $L^1(\nu)$, let Y_d denote the space of all dominated sequences (y_n) in Y , under the norm $\|(y_n)\|_d = \int \sup_n |y_n| d\mu$. We easily

check that Y_d is a Banach space; evidently then T induces a linear operator S from Y_d to $(L^1(\nu))_d$, which has closed graph, since T itself is bounded. Thus S is bounded.

(c) $\Rightarrow$ (a) follows immediately from Grothendieck's L^1 -inequality (1). We give here an alternate proof of (1), using the set up in [P1]. We will freely use here some standard facts about $Y \widehat{\otimes} Z$, the projective tensor product of Banach spaces Y and Z . Let $L^1(\mu, Y)$ denote the space of Bochner-integrable Y -valued functions on Ω (where $(\Omega, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$ is the measure space associated to μ). Then $L^1(\mu, Y)$ is (canonically isometric to) $L^1(\mu) \widehat{\otimes} Y$ (see Théorème 2, page 59 of [G]). It follows immediately that $T \otimes I$ yields a linear operator from $L^1(\mu) \otimes Y$ to $L^1(\nu) \otimes Y$ with $\|T \otimes I\| = \|T\|$. (Here, we assume " X " = $L^1(\mu)$; i.e., the hypotheses of (1).) We apply this fact to $Y = L^\infty(\nu)$. It follows that for any n , $f_1, \dots, f_n$ in $L^1(\mu)$, and $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n$ in $L^\infty(\nu)$.

$$(32) \quad \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n T f_i \otimes \varphi_i \right\| \leq \|T\| \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n f_i \otimes \varphi_i \right\|.$$

Here, $g \stackrel{\text{df}}{=} \sum f_i \otimes \varphi_i$ denotes the element of $L^1(\mu, L^\infty(\nu))$ defined by $g(\omega) = \sum f_i(\omega) \varphi_i$, $\omega \in \Omega$; note that

$$(33) \quad \|g\| = \int \|g(\omega)\| d\mu(\omega) = \int \text{ess sup}_s \left| \sum f_i(\omega) \varphi_i(s) \right| d\mu(\omega).$$

Now fixing $f_1, \dots, f_n$ and $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n$ as above, we have

$$(34) \quad \begin{aligned} & \left| \int \sum (T f_j)(s) \varphi_j(s) d\nu(s) \right| \\ & \leq \int \text{ess sup}_t \left| \sum_{j=1}^n (T f_j)(s) \varphi_j(t) \right| d\nu(s) \\ & \leq \|T\| \int \text{ess sup}_t \left| \sum f_j(\omega) \varphi_j(t) \right| d\mu(\omega) \quad \text{by (32) and (33)} \\ & \leq \|T\| \left(\int \max_j |f_j(\omega)| d\mu(\omega) \right) \left\| \sum \varphi_j \right\|_{L^\infty(\nu)}. \end{aligned}$$

Now since ν is nice, a standard argument yields that we may choose $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n$ in $L^\infty(\nu)$ with $\left\| \sum \varphi_j \right\|_{L^\infty(\nu)} = 1$ and

$$(35) \quad \int \max |T f_j|(s) d\nu(s) = \int \sum (T f_j)(s) \varphi_j(s) d\nu(s).$$

Evidently (34) and (35) immediately yield Grothendieck's inequality (1).

It remains to prove (c) $\Rightarrow$ (d) and the “moreover” statement, i.e., M. Lévy's theorem. We closely follow the brief sketch given by Pisier in [P1], crystallizing some elements of the discussion. It is convenient to introduce one more condition in the Extension Theorem, which is explicitly used in [P1].

- (d) *There is a constant C so that for any n , $f_1, \dots, f_n$ in X , and simple $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n$ in $L^\infty(\nu)$,*

$$(36) \quad \left| \sum_i \int (Tf_i)\varphi_i d\nu \right| \leq C \int \operatorname{ess\,sup}_s \left| \sum f_i(\omega)\varphi_i(s) \right| d\mu(\omega) .$$

We first prove (d) $\Rightarrow$ (c). Consider the following general problem: Given Banach spaces Y, B, X a closed linear subspace of Y , $T : X \rightarrow B^*$ a bounded linear operator, and $C > 0$, when does there exist $\tilde{T} : Y \rightarrow B^*$ extending T , with $\|\tilde{T}\| \leq C$? Is there a way of formulating this problem in terms of the Hahn-Banach Theorem? As e.g., developed in [G], $\mathcal{L}(Y, B^*)$ is indeed, naturally isometric to $(Y \hat{\otimes} B)^*$. The pairing is as follows: given $T : Y \rightarrow B^*$ a bounded linear operator and $\omega \stackrel{\text{df}}{=} \sum y_i \otimes b_i$ in $(Y \hat{\otimes} B)^*$ (with $\sum \|y_i\| \|b_i\| < \infty$), set

$$(37) \quad \langle T, \omega \rangle = \sum_i \langle Ty_i, b_i \rangle .$$

We then obtain the following result:

Lemma 3. *Given Y, B, X , and T as above, the following are equivalent:*

- (i) *There is a linear operator $\tilde{T} : Y \rightarrow B^*$ extending T , with $\|\tilde{T}\| \leq C$.*
- (ii) *Let X_0, B_0 be dense linear subspaces of X and B respectively and regard $X_0 \otimes B_0$ as a linear subspace of $Y \hat{\otimes} B$. Define F_T on $X_0 \otimes B_0$ by $F_T(\omega) = \langle T, \omega \rangle$ for all ω in $X \otimes B$. Then*

$$(38) \quad \|F_T\| \leq C .$$

To see this, note that (i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii) is immediate. If (ii) holds, let $\tilde{F}_T$ be a Hahn-Banach extension of F_T to $Y \hat{\otimes} B^*$. Now simply let $\tilde{T}$ be the unique element of $\mathcal{L}(X, B^*)$ satisfying

$$(39) \quad \langle \tilde{T}, \omega \rangle = \tilde{F}_T(\omega) \text{ for some } \omega \in Y \hat{\otimes} B^* .$$

To obtain (d) $\Rightarrow$ (c) of the Extension Theorem, let $X = X_0$, $Y = L^1(\mu)$, $B = L^\infty(\nu)$, and B_0 the subspace of B consisting of simple functions. Now condition (d) simply means that $\|F_T\| \leq C$, where F_T is as in Lemma 3(ii). Thus by Lemma 3, we obtain a linear operator $\tilde{T} : L^1(\mu) \rightarrow L^1(\nu)^{**}$ extending T (where of course we regard $L^1(\nu) \subset L^1(\nu)^{**}$). The proof is completed by observing that there exists a norm-one linear projection P from $L^1(\nu)^{**}$ onto $L^1(\nu)$; then $P \circ \tilde{T}$ yields the desired operator extending T .

It remains to show that (b) $\Rightarrow$ (d).

The argument for this implication involves a critical identification, due to M. Lévy [L], and appears to have been omitted from the sketch given in [P1].

Lemma 4. *Let B_0 denote the subspace of $L^\infty(\nu)$ consisting of simple functions, and let $g \in X \otimes B_0$. Then*

$$(40) \quad \|g\| = \min \left\{ \int \max_j |f_j| d\mu \left\| \sum_i |\varphi_i| \right\|_\infty \right\}$$

the minimum taken over all n , $f_1, \dots, f_n$ in X , and $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n$ in B_0 so that $g = \sum f_j \otimes \varphi_j$ (where $\|g\|$ is defined as in (33)).

Proof of Lemma 4. Suppose first $g = \sum f_j \otimes \varphi_j$ where $f_1, \dots, f_n$ are in $L^1(\mu)$, $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n$ are in $L^\infty(\nu)$ (we do not need to assume here that the f_i 's belong to X). We then have that for any ω and any s ,

$$(41) \quad \left| \sum_{j=1}^n f_j(\omega) \varphi_j(s) \right| \leq \max_j |f_j(\omega)| \sum_j |\varphi_j|(s) .$$

It follows immediately that

$$(42) \quad \|g\| \leq \int \max |f_j(\omega)| d\mu(\omega) \left\| \sum |\varphi_j| \right\|_{\infty}.$$

Thus

$$(43) \quad \|g\| \leq \inf \left\{ \int \max_j |f_j| d\mu \left\| \sum |\varphi_j| \right\|_{\infty} : g = \sum_{j=1}^n f_j \otimes \varphi_j \right. \\ \left. \text{with } f_j \in L^1(\mu) \text{ and } \varphi_j \in B_0 \text{ for all } j \right\}.$$

Now $g = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} x_i \otimes \psi_i$ with the x_i 's in X and the ψ_i 's in B_0 . We may then choose a ν -measurable partition $E_1, \dots, E_m$ of S so that the ψ_i 's are all $\mathcal{A}$ -measurable, where $\mathcal{A}$ is the algebra generated by the disjoint sets $E_1, \dots, E_n$. (Here, we assume $L^1(\nu) = L^1(S, \mathcal{E}, \nu)$.) It *then* follows that we may choose $z_1, \dots, z_m$ in X with

$$(44) \quad g = \sum_{i=1}^m z_i \otimes \chi_{E_i}.$$

But then if $\omega \in \Omega$ and $s \in E_i$,

$$(45) \quad |g(\omega)(s)| = |z_i(\omega)|.$$

This shows

$$\|g(\omega)\|_{L^{\infty}(\mu)} = \max_i |z_i(\omega)|.$$

Hence

$$(46) \quad \|g\| = \int \max_i |z_i| d\mu \\ = \int \max_i |z_i| d\mu \left\| \sum |\chi_{E_j}| \right\|_{\infty},$$

proving (40). $\square$

We finally show that (b) $\Rightarrow$ (d), thus completing the proof of the Extension Theorem. (The moreover assertion follows from the proof that (d) $\Rightarrow$ (c), for of course we show the same constant C in (b) works for (d).)

Let then $f_1, \dots, f_n$ be given in X , $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n$ be simple elements of $L^\infty(\nu)$, and let C be as in (b).

By Lemma 4, we may choose $x_1, \dots, x_m$ in X and $\psi_1, \dots, \psi_m$ simple in $L^\infty(\nu)$ so that letting $g = \sum f_i \otimes \varphi_i$, then

$$(46)(i) \quad g = \sum x_i \otimes \psi_i$$

$$(46)(ii) \quad \|g\| = \int \max_i |x_i| d\mu \left\| \sum |\psi_j| \right\|_\infty.$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned} (47) \quad \left| \sum_i \int (Tf_i) \varphi_i d\mu \right| &= \left| \sum_i \langle Tf_i, \varphi_i \rangle \right| = \left| \sum_i \langle Tx_i, \psi_i \rangle \right| \text{ (by (46)(i))} \\ &\leq \int \sum_i |Tx_i(s) \psi_i(s)| d\nu(s) \\ &\leq \int \max_i |Tx_i(s)| \left\| \sum |\psi_j| \right\|_\infty d\nu(s) \\ &\leq C \int \max |x_i(\omega)| d\mu(\omega) \left\| \sum |\psi_j| \right\|_\infty \text{ (by (b))} \\ &= C \|g\| \\ &= C \int \text{ess sup}_s \left| \sum f_i(\omega) \varphi_i(s) \right| d\mu(\omega). \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the Extension Theorem. $\square$

The following representation result follows from the above proof of M. Lévy's theorem, and seems to be what's "really going on" (see also Lemma 1 of [L]).

Corollary. *Let X be a closed linear subspace of $L^1(\mu)$, and let $X(L^\infty(\nu))$ denote the closure of $X \otimes L^\infty(\nu)$ in $L^1(\mu, L^\infty(\nu))$. Then given $g \in X(L^\infty(\nu))$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a dominated sequence (x_j) in X and a sequence (φ_j) in $L^\infty(\nu)$ so that*

- (i) $\sum \varphi_j$ converges unconditionally in $L^\infty(\nu)$.

$$(ii) \quad g = \sum x_j \otimes \varphi_j.$$

$$(iii) \quad \int \sup_j |x_j(\omega)| d\mu(\omega) \left\| \sum_i |\varphi_i| \right\|_{L^\infty(\nu)} \leq \|g\| + \varepsilon.$$

Remarks. 1. If (x_j) in X is dominated and $\sum \varphi_j$ in $L^\infty(\nu)$ converges unconditionally, then $\sum x_j \otimes \varphi_j$ converges unconditionally in $L^1(\mu, L^\infty(\nu))$, to an element of $X(L^\infty(\nu))$. Indeed, for any choice of scalars (α_j) with $|\alpha_j| \leq 1$ for all j and any $k \leq \ell$, we have that

$$(48) \quad \left\| \sum_{j=k}^{\ell} \alpha_j x_j \otimes \varphi_j \right\| \leq \int \max_j |x_j(\omega)| d\mu(\omega) \left\| \sum_{j=k}^{\ell} |\varphi_j| \right\|_{\infty}.$$

But $\sum \varphi_j$ converges unconditionally iff

$$\left\| \sum_k^{\ell} |\varphi_j| \right\|_{\infty} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty \text{ with } \ell \geq k.$$

Hence $\sum \alpha_j x_j \otimes \varphi_j$ converges by (48).

2. Suppose (x_j) in X and (φ_j) in $L^\infty(\nu)$ satisfy

$$\int \sup_j |x_j| d\mu \left\| \sum_i |\varphi_i| \right\|_{\infty} \stackrel{\text{df}}{=} \tau < \infty.$$

(Equivalently, (x_j) is dominated and $\sum \varphi_j$ is weakly unconditionally summing in $L^\infty(\nu)$.) It then follows that for μ -almost all ω , $\sup_j |x_j(\omega)| < \infty$; for each such ω , we obtain that $\sum x_j(\omega) \varphi_j$ converges absolutely pointwise a.e. to an element of $L^\infty(\nu)$, and the function $g(\omega) \stackrel{\text{df}}{=} \sum x_j(\omega) \varphi_j$ belongs to $L^1(\mu, L^\infty(\nu))$ with $\|g\| \leq \tau$. Does it then follow that g belongs to $X(L^\infty(\nu))$? This is indeed so provided X is isomorphic to a separable dual space, or more generally, a dual space with the Radon-Nikodym property.

Proof of the Corollary. Letting B_0 denote the space of the simple $L^\infty(\nu)$ functions as above, we have that $L^1(\mu) \otimes B_0$ is dense in $L^1(\mu) \hat{\otimes} L^\infty(\nu)$ since B_0 is dense in $L^\infty(\nu)$. Hence given $\varepsilon > 0$, we may choose a sequence (g_j) in $L^1(\mu) \otimes B_0$ with

$$(49) \quad \left(\sum \|g_j\|^{1/2} \right)^2 < \|g\| + \varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad g = \sum g_j.$$

Now by Lemma 4, for each i , we may choose finite sequences $(x_{ij})_{j=1}^{m_i}$ in X and $(\varphi_{ij})_{j=1}^{m_i}$ in B_0 with $g_i = \sum_j x_{ij} \otimes \varphi_{ij}$ and

$$(50) \quad \int \max_j |x_{ij}| d\mu(\omega) = \|g_i\|^{1/2} = \left\| \sum_j |\varphi_{ij}| \right\|_{\infty}.$$

Hence the series $\sum_i \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} x_{ij} \otimes \varphi_{ij}$ converges unconditionally to g . Now we have moreover that

$$(51) \quad \begin{aligned} \int \sup_i \max_j |x_{ij}| d\mu(\omega) &\leq \sum_i \int \max_j |x_{ij}| d\mu(\omega) \\ &\leq \sum |g_j|^{1/2} \text{ by (50).} \end{aligned}$$

Thus the sequence (x_{ij}) with $1 \leq j \leq m_i$, $i = 1, 2, \dots$ is indeed dominated. Also $\sum_i \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} \varphi_{ij}$ converges unconditionally in $L^{\infty}(\nu)$ and

$$(52) \quad \left\| \sum_i \sum_j |\varphi_{ij}| \right\|_{\infty} \leq \sum_i \left\| \sum_j |\varphi_{ij}| \right\|_{\infty} \leq \sum |g_j|^{1/2} \text{ by (50).}$$

The Corollary now follows immediately from (49)–(52). $\square$

REFERENCES

- [G] A. Grothendieck, *Produits tensoriels topologiques et espaces nucléaires*, Memoirs AMS **16** (1955).
- [L] M. Lévy, *Prolongement d'un opérateur d'un sous-espace de $L^1(\mu)$ dans $L^1(\nu)$* , Séminaire d'Analyse Fonctionnelle 1979-1980. Exposé 5. Ecole Polytechnique, Palaiseau.
- [M] V. Mascioni, *Optimal lattice decompositions*, preprint.
- [P1] G. Pisier, *Interpolation of H^p -spaces and noncommutative generalizations II*, Revista Mat. Iberoamericana (to appear).
- [P2] G. Pisier, *Complex interpolation and regular operators between Banach lattices*, Arch. der Mat. (to appear).
- [P3] G. Pisier, *Regular operators between non-commutative L_p -spaces* (to appear).
- [S] H.H. Schaefer, *Banach lattices and positive operators*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-Heidelberg-New York, 1974.